

Regarding the rejection of claims 1 and 12 under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Breeden et al.; the rejection of claim 13 as being unpatentable over Breeden et al. and further in view of GSM System for Mobile Communications (GSM); and the rejection of claims 2-4 under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Breeden et al. and further in view of Daly et al. and GSM, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the following reason.

Claim 1 defines a communication system wherein, among other things, a base station that initiates a call and sends an identification number to a call routing equipment over a wireline network that has caller identification. Further, the call routing equipment receives a base station routing number via caller identification and uses the routing number and identification number to route subsequent call to the base station.

On the other hand, as the Examiner recognizes, Breeden et al. does not disclose the wireline network having caller identification and, moreover, the Examiner has not provided a teaching for the claimed feature that "said call routing equipment receiving a base station routing number via caller identification." Instead the Examiner states the "it is well known in the art for the PSTN to utilize automatic number identification technology" and thus "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include caller identification in the system to increase the efficiency of the system in routing calls to users."

Applicants submit that even if it was known in the art for the PSTN to utilize automatic number identification technology and one was motivated to include automatic number identification technology in the teachings of Breeden et al. for the general and vague purpose of increasing the efficiency of the system in routing calls to users, there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the cited references to combine automatic number identification technology with the teachings of Breeden et al. to produce the specific claimed feature of the "call routing equipment receiving a base station routing number via caller identification and using the base station identification number and routing number to route subsequent calls to said base station." If the Examiner believes that it is well known to provide automatic number identification technology for the specific claimed feature, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite a reference in support of his position pursuant to MPEP § 706.02(a).

Accordingly, at least for this reason, the invention defined by claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Breeden et al. Thus the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Breeden et al. should be withdrawn. Furthermore, amended claims 2 and 4 and original claim 12 are allowable at least because they define the features of the wireline network having caller identification or the authorization equipment receiving the telephone number or subscriber name via caller identification or both. Also, claim 13 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency on allowable claim 12.

Regarding the rejection of claims 5-11 under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Fujisawa, Applicants submit that the amendment of claim 5 overcomes this rejection for the following reason.

Amended claim 5 defines, among other things, a wireline network having caller identification and capable of sending caller identification information, and a base station capable of receiving the caller identification information and storing a plurality of call identification messages for transmission. In contrast, none of the cited references disclose the wireline network having caller identification or the bases station that receives the caller identification and stores caller identification messages.

Accordingly, at least for this reason, the invention defined by amended claim 5 is patentably distinguishable over Fujisawa. Thus the rejection of claim 5 under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn. Furthermore, claims 6-11 are allowable at least at least by virtue of their dependency on allowable claim 5.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 13-4768. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL J. SCHELLINGER et al.

By Donald C. Kordich
Donald C. Kordich
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 38,213
Phone: (708) 523-2328
Fax: (708) 523-2350

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

by

Tamra Smith

Tamra Smith

on

August 10, 1995

Date